



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/567,850      | 02/10/2006  | Chang Wook Kim       | 9988.299.00-US      | 7333             |

30827 7590 08/11/2008  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3749

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

08/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |  |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/567,850 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>KIM, CHANG WOOK |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Stephen Gravini   | <b>Art Unit</b><br>3749                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 February 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Those claims have been amended to include subject matter not found in the originally filed application such that new matter has been added to the claims in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. More specifically claim 1 now recited portions, but the originally filed application is limited to a single portion. Also the claimed support sleeve **22** is not shown in the drawings such that it would reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the application had possession of this feature. Furthermore claim 8 now recites a positioning projection instead of the originally filed positioning projection. In the new recitation, the projection is now a structural feature instead of the earlier recited functional projection feature. The new recitation is new matter without basis formed in the originally filed application

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102T***

Claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sisler (US 4,069,596). The claims are reasonably and broadly construed, in light of the accompanying specification, to be disclosed by Sisler as comprising:

a cylindrical drum **8** main body formed through a seam-welding process at column 2 lines 47;

a drum head comprising a main head rim **15** having a predetermined width in a direction toward a center of the drum main body, the main head rim being coupled to a first end of the drum main body and provided with a plurality of elevated portion, and a support sleeve bent from an end of the main head rim as shown in figure 1;

a drum rear wall **13** coupled to a second end of the drum main body and provided with a plurality of hot wind introducing holes **27**; and

a lift **14** coupled to an inner circumference of the drum main body to lift the laundry. Sisler also discloses the claimed main body provided with at least one penetration hole **18** used for coupling the lift on the drum main body, wherein a portion where the penetration hole is formed is depressed from an outer circumference of the drum main body as shown in figure 1, and wherein the lift is provided at a bottom surface with a positioning projection that is to be inserted into the penetration hole at column 2 line 50.

Claims 8-10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by St Louis (US 4,628, 617). The claims are reasonably and broadly construed, in light of the accompanying specification, to be disclosed by St Louis as comprising:

a cylindrical drum **12** main body provided with at least one coupling hole;

a drum head **38** coupled to a first end of the drum main body;

a drum rear wall **14** coupled to a second end of the drum main body; and

a lift **22** mounted on an inner circumference of the drum main body and provided at a bottom surface with positioning projection **32** inserted in the coupling hole and with a boss in which a coupling member is inserted. St Louis also discloses the claimed inner circumference defining the coupling hole in which the positioning projection is inserted is bent outward of the drum main body as shown in figure 2, wherein a portion where the coupling hole is formed is depressed to define a conflicting prevention groove at column 2 line 47, and wherein the lift is fixed on the drum main body by a coupling member penetrating the coupling hole and inserted in the boss as shown in figure 2.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 2-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sisler. Sisler discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed forming process, welding portion, and head wall seam-weld. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide those types of forming fabrications, since the prior art teachings of Sisler would perform the invention as claimed, regardless of the type of forming process, welding portion, or head wall seam-weld.

Claims 11-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over St Louis. St Louis discloses the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed hole depth or location and coupling member location. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide those types of forming fabrications, since the prior art teachings of St Louis would perform the invention as claimed, regardless of the hole depth or location and coupling member location.

### ***Double Patenting***

Claims 1-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,340,849. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to recite the claimed seam weld process with the applicant assignee patented drum structure for greater strength, durability, and fabrication stability.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in part in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Double patenting***

Since applicant relies on new amended claim subject matter to overcome the double patenting rejection, the rejection is maintained because the originally filed application does not have basis for the new subject matter.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven B. McAllister can be reached on 571 272 6785. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3749

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen Gravini/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3749